



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/658,332 | 09/08/2000 | Teddy A. Demirjian | WIZZ.002DV1 | 2582 |

20995 7590 09/20/2004

KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP
2040 MAIN STREET
FOURTEENTH FLOOR
IRVINE, CA 92614

EXAMINER

COLBERT, ELLA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3624

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 6, 8, and 9 are pending in this communication filed 04/08/04. Claim 6 has been amended and claims 1-5 and 7 have been cancelled and new claims 8 and 9 have been added. The objections and rejections are as stated below:
2. Therefore, claims 6, 8 and 9 are under prosecution on the merits in this application.
3. The Examiner acknowledges the Applicant's amendment to claim 6 and the cancellation of claims 1-5 and 7 and therefore withdraws the prior office action's rejection of 35 U.S.C. 101.
4. Applicant's arguments filed on 04/08/04 have been fully considered and the rationale for this rejection is encompassed in the 35 U.S.C. Rejection and prior art rejection as set forth here below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 6 is unclear and vague because the Examiner does not understand what the Applicant is attempting to claim and the actual structure is to allow the users to have access to the stored data since Applicant is claiming a system. What is used to analyze the transactions and modify the profiles? The "wherein" clause has multiple somethings missing that are needed to access the database. Where do the

Art Unit: 3624

conflicts come from that are being resolved before the conflicting requests are processed?

The Examiner is unable to determine the metes and bounds of claim 6 because of the manner in which the claim limitations are written. Therefore the art is being applied in light of 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

The Examiner has applied the best art that is considered applicable according to the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 6, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (US 6,430,542) Moran in view of (US 6,615,258) Barry et al, hereafter Barry.

Claim 6. Moran teaches, An information management system accessible simultaneously to a plurality of users, said system comprising: at least one server coupled to an investment advisor computer network comprising computers used by portfolio managers and equity traders (col. 8, line 64-col. 9, line 12 (each PC- more than one), col. 7, lines 16-22, fig. 2 (224-database), Fig. 6 (241-servers), col. 11, line 32-col. 12, line 28));

Moran failed to teach, at least one database hosted by said at least one server having stored thereon a plurality of user profiles which correlate system users with user specific

Art Unit: 3624

data manipulation logic and data display format, said at least one database also having stored thereon client transaction information such that client transaction information is available for display and manipulation to the investment advisor firm as well as broker/dealer firms and custodian banks in accordance with a user profile defined for each corresponding user.

Barry teaches, at least one database ((col. 18, lines 30-36) hosted by said at least one server (col. 6, lines 43-44) having stored thereon a plurality of user profiles (col. 19, lines 34-36 & fig. 7 (30)) which correlate system users with user specific data manipulation logic and data display format (col. 16, lines 33-60), said at least one database also having stored thereon client transaction information such that client transaction information is available for display (col.14, lines 57-67) and manipulation to the investment advisor firm as well as broker/dealer firms and custodian banks in accordance with a user profile defined for each corresponding user (fig. 7). Barry did not expressly teach an investment advisor firm as well as broker/dealer firms and custodian banks. However, Barry teaches a transaction manager which could be a broker/dealer. Moran teaches, an investment advisor firm as well as broker/dealer firms and custodian banks (col. 1, lines 22-67). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Barry's at least one server having storing a plurality of user profiles which correlate system user with user specific data manipulation logic and data display format and at least one database storing client transaction information such that the transaction information is available for display with Moran's investment advisor firm because such an incorporation would

Art Unit: 3624

allow Moran to have a multi-user database system with user profiles and user specific data that can be displayed.

Moran failed to teach, Barry teaches, a user profile and session manager configured to process the at least one user profile to determine which information is available to a user and a data display format that at least in part defines system operation; a transaction manager configured to (1) receive transaction requests from said user profile and session manager, said transaction requests operative to produce changes to database content and user display, and also configured to (2) forward transactions that the user is authorized to perform to transaction execution modules, wherein said forwarding comprises transmitting a logic execution request for database changes to a business logic manager configured to execute the transactions that the user is authorized to perform and transmitting a presentation request to a presentation dialog manager configured to display data to the screen according to the user profile, wherein the business logic manager and presentation dialog manager are configured to execute said requests in parallel.

Barry teaches, a user profile (fig. 7) and session manager (col. 6, lines 57-66) configured to process the at least one user profile to determine which information is available to a user and a data display format that at least in part defines system operation; a transaction manager (fig. 16b (2320)) configured to (1) receive transaction requests from said user profile (fig. 7) and session manager (col. 6, lines 57-66), said transaction requests (fig. 16b (2310)) operative to produce changes to database content and user display (col. 40, lines 45-61), and also configured to (2) forward transactions

Art Unit: 3624

that the user is authorized to perform to transaction execution modules, wherein said forwarding comprises transmitting a logic execution request for database changes to a business logic manager (fig. 1 (20)) configured to execute the transactions that the user is authorized to perform and transmitting a presentation request to a presentation dialog manager (fig. 1 (12)) configured to display data to the screen according to the user profile (fig. 5), wherein the business logic manager and presentation dialog manager (col. 37-54) are configured to execute said requests in parallel (col. 41, line 55- col. 42, line 58).

Moran teaches, an information manager configured to store executed transactions in the at least one database, said executed transactions being capable of modifying user profiles in response to modifications of client transaction information (col.11, lines 4-62)

Moran failed to teach, wherein said user profile and session manager monitors requests currently pending and the request currently executing and is configured to resolve conflicting database update requests before conflicting requests are processed by the transaction manager. Barry teaches, wherein said user profile and session manager monitors requests currently pending and the request currently executing and is configured to resolve conflicting database update requests before conflicting requests are processed by the transaction manager (col. 6, lines 57-66, fig. 7, and fig. 16b (2310)). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Barry's user profile and session manager monitoring requests currently pending and the request currently executing and to be

Art Unit: 3624

configured to resolve conflicting database update requests before conflicting requests are processed by the transaction manager with Moran's information manager configured to stored executed transactions in at least one database with the executed transactions being capable of modifying user profiles in response to modifications of client transaction information because such an incorporation would allow Moran to have a data processing system for providing transaction management services over the internet.

Claim 8. Moran failed to teach, The system of Claim 6, wherein said server is coupled to said investment advisor network of computers via the Internet.

Barry teaches, said server is coupled to said investment advisor network of computers via the Internet (col.2, lines 47-49 and fig. 1 (22 and 24). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the server coupled to the investment advisor network of computers via the Internet and to modify in Moran because such a modification would allow Moran to have a more efficient and economical investor advisor system.

Claim 9. Moran failed to teach, The system of Claim 8, wherein said investment advisor computers access said server via a browser application. Barry teaches, wherein said investment advisor computers access said server via a browser application (col. 2, lines 47-65 and fig. 2 (20 & 24). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the investment advisor computers access the server via a browser application and to modify

Art Unit: 3624

in Moran because such a modification would allow Moran to provide investment advisory services over the Internet using a server to access the browser application.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

Northington et al (US 6,128,602) disclosed financial transactions and Web-browser software.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Inquiries

Art Unit: 3624

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ella Colbert whose telephone number is 703-308-7064.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on 703-308-1038. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



E. Colbert
September 14, 2004



VINCENT MILLIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600